



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/526,115

02/28/2005

Juha Kaario

915-008.031

8532

4955

7590

03/12/2010

WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP  
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5  
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224  
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, VAN KIM T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2456

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/12/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/526,115	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KAARIO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Van Kim T. Nguyen	<b>Art Unit</b> 2456	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)         | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is responsive to communications filed on February 22, 2010. Claims 1-16 are presented for examination.

#### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on February 22, 2010 has been entered.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. Claims 1-2, 4, 8, 12 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rudolph et al (US 2001/0054082).

Regarding claim 12, Rudolf discloses a product comprising a radio frequency identification transponder (12, Fig. 1; ¶¶[0022-0025 and 0035]), wherein the transponder

Art Unit: 2456

comprises tag information corresponding to a multimedia object (¶[0038]), wherein the tag information is intended to be retrieved by a portable, digital device (14, Fig. 1; ¶[0026]) for facilitating the creation of a multimedia message with the tag information in the multimedia message (¶[0036-0037]).

Regarding claim 8, Rudolph discloses an apparatus (Fig.1) comprising:

a tag reader (14, Fig. 1; ¶[0026 and 0036]) configured to emit an interrogating radio signal in order to stimulate a radio frequency identification transponder tag (12, Fig. 1; ¶[0022-0025]) to emit a response signal, which includes tag information (unique product identification, serial number, and URL or other reference to a Web site; ¶[0035]), associated with a multimedia object (¶[0038]), the tag reader further configures to receive such a response signal (¶[0036]); and

a processor (16, Fig. 1) configured to initiate the transmission of a message based upon the *received* tag information; wherein the processor is further configured to provide the tag information received from the radio frequency identification transponder into the message generated in the apparatus (¶[0036-0037]).

Claims 1 and 15-16 are rejected under the same basis.

Regarding claim 2, Rudolph also discloses the tag information includes the multimedia object (¶[0038]).

Regarding claim 4, Rudolf also discloses the tag information is a link to the multimedia object, which is stored in a database (¶[0037-0038] ).

Art Unit: 2456

6. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rudolph, as applied to claim 2 above, in view of Kovesdi et al (US 2003/0155413).

Regarding claim 3, Rudolph does not explicitly disclose the user is prompted to accept or reject the inclusion of the multimedia object into the message.

Kovesdi teaches the user is prompted to accept or reject the inclusion of the multimedia object into the message (¶¶[0076-0079]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Kovesdi's teaching of prompting user to accept or reject the inclusion of the multimedia object into the message in Rudolph's system, motivated by the desire to provide easy access and seamless browsing.

7. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rudolph, as applied to claim 4 above, in view of Kovesdi et al (US 2003/0155413).

Regarding claim 5, Rudolph-Kovesdi also discloses the database is stored in the portable, digital device (Figure 2; Kovesdi, ¶¶[0047 and 0071]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Kovesdi's teaching of storing the database in the portable, digital device in Rudolph's system, motivated by the desire to provide easy access and seamless browsing.

Regarding claim 6, Rudolph-Kovesdi also discloses the database is stored in a node in a mobile communication system, where the portable, digital device is registered (Figure 2; Kovesdi, ¶[0049-0051] and ¶[0071]).

Art Unit: 2456

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Kovesdi's teaching of storing the database in a node of a mobile communication system in Rudolph's system, motivated by the desire to provide easy access and seamless browsing.

Regarding claim 7, Rudolph-Kovesdi also discloses the database is stored in an internet server, which is accessible for a node in a mobile communication system, where the portable, digital device is registered (Figure 2; Kovesdi, ¶[0049-0051] and ¶[0071]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Kovesdi's teaching of storing the database in an internet server in Rudolph's system, motivated by the desire to provide easy access and seamless browsing.

8. Claims 10-11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rudolph, as applied to claim 8 above, in view of Kovesdi et al (US 2003/0155413).

Regarding claim 10, Rudolph does not explicitly disclose displaying the multimedia object before transmitting the message.

Kovesdi teaches displaying the multimedia object before transmitting the message (¶[0045]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Kovesdi's displaying the multimedia object before transmitting the message in Rudolph's system, motivated by the desire to provide easy access and seamless browsing.

Claim 11 is rejected under the same basis.

Art Unit: 2456

Regarding claim 14, Rudolph does not explicitly disclose a mobile phone comprising the apparatus.

Kovesdi teaches a mobile phone comprising the apparatus (Fig. 9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Kovesdi's including a mobile phone in Rudolph's system, motivated by the desire to provide easy access and seamless browsing.

9. Claims 9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rudolph, as applied to claim 8 above, in view of Kenny et al (US 6,989,741).

Regarding claim 9, Rudolf does not explicitly disclose a keyboard and including a key-lock functionality, wherein the processor is configured to activate the key-lock functionality if the response signal indicating the portable digital device resides within a predetermined range from the RFID-transponder.

Kenny teaches a key-lock functionality, and the processor is configured to activate the key-lock functionality if the response signal indicating the portable digital device resides within a predetermined range from the RFID-transponder (col. 4: lines 30-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Kenny's method of tracking assets in Rudolph's system in order to better manage and track electronic assets.

Claim 13 is rejected under the same basis.

Art Unit: 2456

***Conclusion***

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Van Kim T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3073. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Rupal D. Dharia/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2400

Van Kim T. Nguyen  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2456

vkkn